



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A TREATISE ON THE LAW OF DOMESTIC RELATIONS. By W. C. Rodgers. In one volume. Chicago: T. H. Flood & Co. 1899. pp. cxxxiii, 900.

This work discloses great industry on the part of the author in the collection of cases and their statement. Mr. Rodgers has devoted himself to a consideration of particular decisions rather than to such an analysis of the cases as would lead to the fixing of general principles and would bring out sharply the conflict of authority on many of the subjects with which he deals. He has shown his respect for judicial opinion in his somewhat extended quotations of *dicta*, and has abstained from any severe criticisms. The book does not distinguish well between general principles and matters of detail and lacks conciseness. Much appears in the body of the work which another author would consign to the footnotes. On the other hand, there might be a more specific discussion of some of the leading cases on disputed questions, such as *Britton v. Turner*, 6 N. H. 481 and *Stark v. Parker*, 2 Pick. 266, cited in the notes to § 780. So the omission of any reference to *King v. Welcome*, 5 Gray 41, in connection with § 789 is unfortunate. The great value of the book to one seeking to reach the cases on the subject quickly is marred by an occasional lack of correspondence between the headnotes and the body of the sections. There is at times a reiteration of the same principle, as in §§ 66 and 78, and a disregard of the proportionate importance of principles. The chief value of the book is in the many cases which it cites.

E. F. M.

COMMENTARIES ON THE PROCEDURE OF CIVIL COURTS IN BRITISH INDIA.

By Hukm Chand. Bombay, 1899. pp. xiv, 127, 834.

The latest book by the author of "*Res Judicata*" and "*Law of Consent*" maintains the high reputation of its predecessors. This work is a commentary on the text of the Indian Code of Civil Procedure of 1882, which was founded upon the English Judicature Act of 1873. "The Indian courts," as Mr. Chand remarks in his preface, "have . . . been incessantly busy with the Code, explaining and developing it in its several parts, and turning out year after year several volumes of decisions, of which the majority, as in all countries, have reference to questions of procedure and practice." This ingenuous statement is a fair comment on the blessings of a code, which, we are told, will put the law within the reach of every reader, and dispense with a legally trained bench and bar. It is borne out by the experience of California, with its dozen volumes of reports in a good year, and by that of New York, with its library of Practice Reports; but the *dictum* should be limited to code states. In Massachusetts, for instance, with its common-law procedure, a somewhat careful investigation has shown that considerably less than one-fifth of all the cases can by the most liberal allowance be said even incidentally to involve any question of practice or procedure. As to the Indian act, it requires over eight hundred pages of comment to elucidate perhaps one fortieth as much legislation.

Mr. Chand's work, as one would have expected, is carefully and thoroughly done. The English and American reports, as well as the Indian reports, are cited in support of the author's propositions, and, it may be added, quite as accurately as an English or American author would cite them.